



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,621	06/03/2005	Tim Neil	93422-48	8383
22463	7590	04/01/2008	EXAMINER	
SMART AND BIGGAR			TURNER, ASHLEY D	
438 UNIVERSITY AVENUE				
SUITE 1500 BOX 111			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TORONTO, ON M5G2K8			2154	
CANADA				
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		04/01/2008	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/537,621	NEIL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	ASHLEY D. TURNER	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/03/2005</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 17 -25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.101.

Independent claim 17, which is drawn towards a machine-readable medium including machine-executable code for execution at a computing device, comprising: machine-executable code for, in response to either of a new application being made available at a server or an updated version of an application being made available at a server, transmitting a message over a wireless connection to a set of wireless communications devices indicating that said new or updated application is available. For the claim to statutory the application must be implemented in a machine readable medium (storage). The claim as read can be considered by one of ordinary skill in the art as software per se, and therefore does not appear to be implemented in a machine readable medium (storage).

Claim 18-25 are rejected for the same reasoning as claim 17 which is described above.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Palaniappan et al hereinafter Palaniappan (US 6,711,557 B1).

### **Regarding claim 1**

Referring to claim 1 Palaniappan discloses A method of facilitating wireless communication device awareness of the availability of new or updated server-side applications, said method comprising: in response to either of a new application being made available at a server or an updated version of an application being made available at a server, transmitting a message over a wireless connection to a set of wireless communications devices indicating that said new or updated application is available. (Col.4 lines 26-41 In one implementation, available updates are handled by the application to which they relate. Thus, when the process determines that an update is available, the corresponding application is notified on the client machine (step 260). The background process can do this by setting a flag in the database that the application examines at a time selected by the application, such as when the application next is executed, by sending a message to the application, or otherwise. The application controls when to handle an available update and whether to ask the user before downloading and installing the update. One particular kind of update is a library file or other shared resource, which may be applicable to more than one application. The process determines if any new shared resources may be wanted for any of the registered applications and, if so, notifies each application.) (Col. 8 lines 11-15 The client

machine can be any digital electronic device configured for program installation and execution, including, by way of example, desktop and laptop personal computers, personal digital assistants, and web-enabled mobile telephones. Accordingly, other embodiments are within the scope of the following claims.)

### **Regarding claims 9 and 17**

Claims 9 and 17 are similarly rejected using the same reasoning / citations provided above for claim 1 since they recite the same limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

### **Regarding claim 2**

Referring to claim 2 Palaniappan discloses all the limitations of claim 2 which is described above. Palaniappan also discloses wherein said set of wireless communications devices is a subset of an overall set of wireless communications devices in communication with said server. (Col.2 lines 9-26 One or more servers remote from the client machine can communicate with the client machine over the Internet, and each server maintains meta-information concerning at least one of the multiple registered applications. The process executes periodically and at that time downloads from one or more of the servers, according to what applications are registered with the process, meta-information specifying what

are the current versions of all components each registered application requires. The process also compares the downloaded meta-information with information obtained on the client machine to identify any registered application for which an update should be performed and sends a notification that an update should be performed to each identified application. The registered applications have programming that can receive a notification from the process running on the client machine and to cause an update to be performed in response to the notification.)

### **Regarding claims 10 and 18**

Claims 10 and 18 are similarly rejected using the same reasoning / citations provided above for claim 2 since they recite the same limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

### **Regarding claim 3**

Referring to claim 3 Palaniappan discloses all the limitations of claim 3 which is described above. Palaniappan also discloses wherein said transmitting is conditional upon said new application or said updated version of an application being added to a group of applications to which access is provided as a whole.( Col.3 lines 13-26 Registered applications 50 include or invoke programming that implements registration and

other features of the updating process that will be described later. In one implementation, this common, client-side programming is in the form of a shared library, such as a Microsoft Windows. TM. dynamic link library (DLL). Generally, this shared component will include code that allows it to update itself, either automatically or in response to a user action. The shared component can make itself available to a user of an application by adding a command to a menu, such as the help menu of the application. Selecting the command causes a user interface window to open through which the user can set preferences and otherwise control operation of the update monitoring feature.)

### **Regarding claims 11 and 19**

Claims 11 and 19 are similarly rejected using the same reasoning / citations provided above for claim 3 since they recite the same limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

### **Regarding claim 4**

Referring to claim 4 Palaniappan discloses all the limitations of claim 4 which is described above. Palaniappan also discloses wherein said transmitting to said subset of wireless communications devices is conditional upon a grant of access by said subset

of wireless communications devices to said group of applications. (Col.3 lines 54-67 and Col. 4 lines 1-2 As shown in FIG. 2, the background process 70 (FIG. 1) on the client machine wakes up periodically and performs a procedure 200 that contacts the server machine (or some substitute, such as a mirror site) over the Internet (step 210). The event that wakes up the process can be the passage of a time interval or some other occurrence. Generally, a time interval will be set by a user, such as once a week after a particular time on a particular day of the week. The process downloads meta-information (step 230) from all web sites identified by registered applications, if any, or from a known or default site. In one implementation, the meta-information is downloaded in the form of an XML file that contains information about all applications participating the background updating process (whether or not they are registered on a particular client machine) that are known to the source web site. Alternatively, the information can be in the form of one or more XML files each specific to a particular vendor and containing information about the participating applications of the vendor.)

### **Regarding claims 12 and 20**

Claims 12 and 20 are similarly rejected using the same reasoning / citations provided above for claim 4 since they recite the same limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

### **Regarding claim 5**

Referring to claim 5 Palaniappan discloses all the limitations of claim 5 which is described above. Palaniappan also discloses wherein said transmitting is dependent upon receipt of an indication from a human operator in response to said new application being made available at said server or said updated version of an application being made available at said server. (Col.1 lines 14-30 When an update is available over the Internet, the user must generally access the relevant web site (i.e., site on the World Wide Web), choose to download an installer application and then run the installer. The user typically lets the installer determine whether or not any new material is applicable to the user's machine. When an update is available on traditional media such as a CD, the same process is required, except there is no downloading step. There are a number of problems with the current method for providing users with software updates. First, users must know when an update is available and how to obtain the update. Second, once users become aware that an update is available, they may be unsure of whether or not they need the proffered update and may go through the time consuming process of running the installer program without any need to do so. Third, providing updates on traditional media has its own problems: most importantly, the significant cost of manufacturing and distributing the updates to users.)

**Regarding claims 13 and 21**

Claim 13 and 21 are similarly rejected using the same reasoning / citations provided above for claim 5 since they recite the same limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

### **Regarding claim 6**

Referring to claim 6 Palaniappan discloses all the limitations of claim 6 which is described above. Palaniappan also discloses wherein said transmitting is triggered automatically in response to said new application being made available at said server or said updated version of an application being made available at said server. (Col. 2 lines 57-67 and Col.1-13 As shown in FIG. 1, one or more applications 50 (shown as 50a, 50b, . . . ) that support client-based update monitoring are installed on client machine 10 and register themselves with an update monitoring process 70 that runs in the background on the client machine. The applications 50 (or their installation processes) each register with the monitoring process, causing an entry to be added to a client-machine-resident database 60 identifying the application, the language of the application (such as English or French), and the location on the client machine of the one or more components of the application. In one implementation, the resident database is simply a data file that stores the information about the participating applications in Extensible Markup Language (XML) format. However, the database can be stored and maintained using a data base management system or any other convenient technology. The resident database can be stored on any non-volatile memory local to the client machine, such

as on a disk drive directly connected to the client machine or on a disk drive that is local to the client machine, for example, a disk drive in a server coupled to the client machine by a local area network. Similarly, the applications 50 can be installed on a drive directly connected to the client machine or on a server on a local area network.)

### **Regarding claims 14 and 22**

Claim 14 and 22 are similarly rejected using the same reasoning / citations provided above for claim 6 since they recite the same limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

### **Regarding claim 7**

Referring to claim 7 Palaniappan discloses all the limitations of claim 7 which is described above. Palaniappan also discloses wherein said message is an eXtenstible Markup Language (XML) message. (Col. 2 lines 57-67 and Col.1-13 As shown in FIG. 1, one or more applications 50 (shown as 50a, 50b, . . . ) that support client-based update monitoring are installed on client machine 10 and register themselves with an update monitoring process 70 that runs in the background on the client machine. The applications 50 (or their installation processes) each register with the monitoring process, causing an entry to be added to a client-

machine-resident database 60 identifying the application, the language of the application (such as English or French), and the location on the client machine of the one or more components of the application. In one implementation, the resident database is simply a data file that stores the information about the participating applications in Extensible Markup Language (XML) format. However, the database can be stored and maintained using a data base management system or any other convenient technology. The resident database can be stored on any non-volatile memory local to the client machine, such as on a disk drive directly connected to the client machine or on a disk drive that is local to the client machine, for example, a disk drive in a server coupled to the client machine by a local area network. Similarly, the applications 50 can be installed on a drive directly connected to the client machine or on a server on a local area network.)

**Regarding claim 15 and 23**

Claim 15 and 23 are similarly rejected using the same reasoning / citations provided above for claim 7 since they recite the same limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

**Regarding claim 8**

Referring to claim 8 Palaniappan discloses all the limitations of claim 8 which is described above. Palaniappan also discloses wherein said message includes a list of applications presently available to said set of wireless communications devices. (Col.1 lines 66-67 and Col.2 lines 1-8 In general, in one aspect, the invention provides methods and apparatus, including computer program products, for providing updates for computer program components on a client machine that can be connected to web sites on the Internet. In this aspect, an update monitoring process running on a client machine maintains a local database of application-related information. The process can receive registration information from, and thereby register, multiple computer program applications installed on the client machine.)

#### **Regarding claims 16 and 24**

Claim 16 and 24 are similarly rejected using the same reasoning / citations provided above for claim 8 since they recite the same limitations and are distinguished only by statutory category.

#### **Regarding claim 25**

Referring to claim 25 Palaniappan discloses all the limitations of claim 25 which is described above. Palaniappan also discloses wherein said set of wireless communication devices is associated with a group of applications and said transmitting is conditional upon said new application or said updated version of an application being

Art Unit: 2154

added to said group of applications. (Col.3 lines 13-26 Registered applications 50 include or invoke programming that implements registration and other features of the updating process that will be described later. In one implementation, this common, client-side programming is in the form of a shared library, such as a Microsoft Windows.TM. dynamic link library (DLL). Generally, this shared component will include code that allows it to update itself, either automatically or in response to a user action. The shared component can make itself available to a user of an application by adding a command to a menu, such as the help menu of the application. Selecting the command causes a user interface window to open through which the user can set preferences and otherwise control operation of the update monitoring feature.)

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashley d. Turner whose telephone number is 571-270-1603. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 7:30a.m. - 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-2603.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Patent Examiner:

---

Ashley Turner

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

/Nathan J. Flynn/

Supervisory Patent Examiner

---

Nathan Flynn

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154/Nathan J. Flynn/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154